

1 J. MICHAEL KALER, SBN 158296
2 9930 Mesa Rim Road, Suite 200
3 San Diego, California 92121
4 Telephone (858) 362-3151
Email: michael@kalerlaw.com

5 MELODY A. KRAMER, SBN 169984
6 9930 Mesa Rim Road, Suite 1600
7 San Diego, California 92121
8 Telephone (858) 362-3150
Email: mak@kramerlawip.com

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff JENS ERIK SORENSEN,
as Trustee of SORENSEN RESEARCH AND
10 DEVELOPMENT TRUST

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13

14 JENS ERIK SORENSEN, as Trustee of) Case No. 08 CV 071 BTM CAB
15 SORENSEN RESEARCH AND)
16 DEVELOPMENT TRUST,) **OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S**
17 Plaintiff,) **MOTION TO STAY PENDING**
18 v.) **OUTCOME OF REEXAMINATION**
19 SENCOPRODUCTS, INC., an Ohio) **PROCEEDINGS**
20 corporation; and DOES 1 – 100,)
21 Defendants.) Date: May 16, 2008
22 _____) Time: 11:00 a.m.
23 and related counterclaims.) Courtroom 15 – 5th Floor
24) The Hon. Barry T. Moskowitz
25)
26) *NO ORAL ARGUMENT*
27) *UNLESS REQUESTED BY THE COURT*
28 _____)
29)
30)
31)
32)
33)
34)
35)
36)
37)
38)
39)
40)
41)
42)
43)
44)
45)
46)
47)
48)
49)
50)
51)
52)
53)
54)
55)
56)
57)
58)
59)
60)
61)
62)
63)
64)
65)
66)
67)
68)
69)
70)
71)
72)
73)
74)
75)
76)
77)
78)
79)
80)
81)
82)
83)
84)
85)
86)
87)
88)
89)
90)
91)
92)
93)
94)
95)
96)
97)
98)
99)
100)
101)
102)
103)
104)
105)
106)
107)
108)
109)
110)
111)
112)
113)
114)
115)
116)
117)
118)
119)
120)
121)
122)
123)
124)
125)
126)
127)
128)
129)
130)
131)
132)
133)
134)
135)
136)
137)
138)
139)
140)
141)
142)
143)
144)
145)
146)
147)
148)
149)
150)
151)
152)
153)
154)
155)
156)
157)
158)
159)
160)
161)
162)
163)
164)
165)
166)
167)
168)
169)
170)
171)
172)
173)
174)
175)
176)
177)
178)
179)
180)
181)
182)
183)
184)
185)
186)
187)
188)
189)
190)
191)
192)
193)
194)
195)
196)
197)
198)
199)
200)
201)
202)
203)
204)
205)
206)
207)
208)
209)
210)
211)
212)
213)
214)
215)
216)
217)
218)
219)
220)
221)
222)
223)
224)
225)
226)
227)
228)
229)
230)
231)
232)
233)
234)
235)
236)
237)
238)
239)
240)
241)
242)
243)
244)
245)
246)
247)
248)
249)
250)
251)
252)
253)
254)
255)
256)
257)
258)
259)
260)
261)
262)
263)
264)
265)
266)
267)
268)
269)
270)
271)
272)
273)
274)
275)
276)
277)
278)
279)
280)
281)
282)
283)
284)
285)
286)
287)
288)
289)
290)
291)
292)
293)
294)
295)
296)
297)
298)
299)
300)
301)
302)
303)
304)
305)
306)
307)
308)
309)
310)
311)
312)
313)
314)
315)
316)
317)
318)
319)
320)
321)
322)
323)
324)
325)
326)
327)
328)
329)
330)
331)
332)
333)
334)
335)
336)
337)
338)
339)
340)
341)
342)
343)
344)
345)
346)
347)
348)
349)
350)
351)
352)
353)
354)
355)
356)
357)
358)
359)
360)
361)
362)
363)
364)
365)
366)
367)
368)
369)
370)
371)
372)
373)
374)
375)
376)
377)
378)
379)
380)
381)
382)
383)
384)
385)
386)
387)
388)
389)
390)
391)
392)
393)
394)
395)
396)
397)
398)
399)
400)
401)
402)
403)
404)
405)
406)
407)
408)
409)
410)
411)
412)
413)
414)
415)
416)
417)
418)
419)
420)
421)
422)
423)
424)
425)
426)
427)
428)
429)
430)
431)
432)
433)
434)
435)
436)
437)
438)
439)
440)
441)
442)
443)
444)
445)
446)
447)
448)
449)
450)
451)
452)
453)
454)
455)
456)
457)
458)
459)
460)
461)
462)
463)
464)
465)
466)
467)
468)
469)
470)
471)
472)
473)
474)
475)
476)
477)
478)
479)
480)
481)
482)
483)
484)
485)
486)
487)
488)
489)
490)
491)
492)
493)
494)
495)
496)
497)
498)
499)
500)
501)
502)
503)
504)
505)
506)
507)
508)
509)
510)
511)
512)
513)
514)
515)
516)
517)
518)
519)
520)
521)
522)
523)
524)
525)
526)
527)
528)
529)
530)
531)
532)
533)
534)
535)
536)
537)
538)
539)
540)
541)
542)
543)
544)
545)
546)
547)
548)
549)
550)
551)
552)
553)
554)
555)
556)
557)
558)
559)
560)
561)
562)
563)
564)
565)
566)
567)
568)
569)
570)
571)
572)
573)
574)
575)
576)
577)
578)
579)
580)
581)
582)
583)
584)
585)
586)
587)
588)
589)
590)
591)
592)
593)
594)
595)
596)
597)
598)
599)
600)
601)
602)
603)
604)
605)
606)
607)
608)
609)
610)
611)
612)
613)
614)
615)
616)
617)
618)
619)
620)
621)
622)
623)
624)
625)
626)
627)
628)
629)
630)
631)
632)
633)
634)
635)
636)
637)
638)
639)
640)
641)
642)
643)
644)
645)
646)
647)
648)
649)
650)
651)
652)
653)
654)
655)
656)
657)
658)
659)
660)
661)
662)
663)
664)
665)
666)
667)
668)
669)
670)
671)
672)
673)
674)
675)
676)
677)
678)
679)
680)
681)
682)
683)
684)
685)
686)
687)
688)
689)
690)
691)
692)
693)
694)
695)
696)
697)
698)
699)
700)
701)
702)
703)
704)
705)
706)
707)
708)
709)
710)
711)
712)
713)
714)
715)
716)
717)
718)
719)
720)
721)
722)
723)
724)
725)
726)
727)
728)
729)
730)
731)
732)
733)
734)
735)
736)
737)
738)
739)
740)
741)
742)
743)
744)
745)
746)
747)
748)
749)
750)
751)
752)
753)
754)
755)
756)
757)
758)
759)
760)
761)
762)
763)
764)
765)
766)
767)
768)
769)
770)
771)
772)
773)
774)
775)
776)
777)
778)
779)
780)
781)
782)
783)
784)
785)
786)
787)
788)
789)
790)
791)
792)
793)
794)
795)
796)
797)
798)
799)
800)
801)
802)
803)
804)
805)
806)
807)
808)
809)
810)
811)
812)
813)
814)
815)
816)
817)
818)
819)
820)
821)
822)
823)
824)
825)
826)
827)
828)
829)
830)
831)
832)
833)
834)
835)
836)
837)
838)
839)
840)
841)
842)
843)
844)
845)
846)
847)
848)
849)
850)
851)
852)
853)
854)
855)
856)
857)
858)
859)
860)
861)
862)
863)
864)
865)
866)
867)
868)
869)
870)
871)
872)
873)
874)
875)
876)
877)
878)
879)
880)
881)
882)
883)
884)
885)
886)
887)
888)
889)
890)
891)
892)
893)
894)
895)
896)
897)
898)
899)
900)
901)
902)
903)
904)
905)
906)
907)
908)
909)
910)
911)
912)
913)
914)
915)
916)
917)
918)
919)
920)
921)
922)
923)
924)
925)
926)
927)
928)
929)
930)
931)
932)
933)
934)
935)
936)
937)
938)
939)
940)
941)
942)
943)
944)
945)
946)
947)
948)
949)
950)
951)
952)
953)
954)
955)
956)
957)
958)
959)
960)
961)
962)
963)
964)
965)
966)
967)
968)
969)
970)
971)
972)
973)
974)
975)
976)
977)
978)
979)
980)
981)
982)
983)
984)
985)
986)
987)
988)
989)
990)
991)
992)
993)
994)
995)
996)
997)
998)
999)
1000)
1001)
1002)
1003)
1004)
1005)
1006)
1007)
1008)
1009)
1010)
1011)
1012)
1013)
1014)
1015)
1016)
1017)
1018)
1019)
1020)
1021)
1022)
1023)
1024)
1025)
1026)
1027)
1028)
1029)
1030)
1031)
1032)
1033)
1034)
1035)
1036)
1037)
1038)
1039)
1040)
1041)
1042)
1043)
1044)
1045)
1046)
1047)
1048)
1049)
1050)
1051)
1052)
1053)
1054)
1055)
1056)
1057)
1058)
1059)
1060)
1061)
1062)
1063)
1064)
1065)
1066)
1067)
1068)
1069)
1070)
1071)
1072)
1073)
1074)
1075)
1076)
1077)
1078)
1079)
1080)
1081)
1082)
1083)
1084)
1085)
1086)
1087)
1088)
1089)
1090)
1091)
1092)
1093)
1094)
1095)
1096)
1097)
1098)
1099)
1100)
1101)
1102)
1103)
1104)
1105)
1106)
1107)
1108)
1109)
1110)
1111)
1112)
1113)
1114)
1115)
1116)
1117)
1118)
1119)
1120)
1121)
1122)
1123)
1124)
1125)
1126)
1127)
1128)
1129)
1130)
1131)
1132)
1133)
1134)
1135)
1136)
1137)
1138)
1139)
1140)
1141)
1142)
1143)
1144)
1145)
1146)
1147)
1148)
1149)
1150)
1151)
1152)
1153)
1154)
1155)
1156)
1157)
1158)
1159)
1160)
1161)
1162)
1163)
1164)
1165)
1166)
1167)
1168)
1169)
1170)
1171)
1172)
1173)
1174)
1175)
1176)
1177)
1178)
1179)
1180)
1181)
1182)
1183)
1184)
1185)
1186)
1187)
1188)
1189)
1190)
1191)
1192)
1193)
1194)
1195)
1196)
1197)
1198)
1199)
1200)
1201)
1202)
1203)
1204)
1205)
1206)
1207)
1208)
1209)
1210)
1211)
1212)
1213)
1214)
1215)
1216)
1217)
1218)
1219)
1220)
1221)
1222)
1223)
1224)
1225)
1226)
1227)
1228)
1229)
1230)
1231)
1232)
1233)
1234)
1235)
1236)
1237)
1238)
1239)
1240)
1241)
1242)
1243)
1244)
1245)
1246)
1247)
1248)
1249)
1250)
1251)
1252)
1253)
1254)
1255)
1256)
1257)
1258)
1259)
1260)
1261)
1262)
1263)
1264)
1265)
1266)
1267)
1268)
1269)
1270)
1271)
1272)
1273)
1274)
1275)
1276)
1277)
1278)
1279)
1280)
1281)
1282)
1283)
1284)
1285)
1286)
1287)
1288)
1289)
1290)
1291)
1292)
1293)
1294)
1295)
1296)
1297)
1298)
1299)
1300)
1301)
1302)
1303)
1304)
1305)
1306)
1307)
1308)
1309)
1310)
1311)
1312)
1313)
1314)
1315)
1316)
1317)
1318)
1319)
1320)
1321)
1322)
1323)
1324)
1325)
1326)
1327)
1328)
1329)
1330)
1331)
1332)
1333)
1334)
1335)
1336)
1337)
1338)
1339)
1340)
1341)
1342)
1343)
1344)
1345)
1346)
1347)
1348)
1349)
1350)
1351)
1352)
1353)
1354)
1355)
1356)
1357)
1358)
1359)
1360)
1361)
1362)
1363)
1364)
1365)
1366)
1367)
1368)
1369)
1370)
1371)
1372)
1373)
1374)
1375)
1376)
1377)
1378)
1379)
1380)
1381)
1382)
1383)
1384)
1385)
1386)
1387)
1388)
1389)
1390)
1391)
1392)
1393)
1394)
1395)
1396)
1397)
1398)
1399)
1400)
1401)
1402)
1403)
1404)
1405)
1406)
1407)
1408)
1409)
1410)
1411)
1412)
1413)
1414)
1415)
1416)
1417)
1418)
1419)
1420)
1421)
1422)
1423)
1424)
1425)
1426)
1427)
1428)
1429)
1430)
1431)
1432)
1433)
1434)
1435)
1436)
1437)
1438)
1439)
1440)
1441)
1442)
1443)
1444)
1445)
1446)
1447)
1448)
1449)
1450)
1451)
1452)
1453)
1454)
1455)
1456)
1457)
1458)
1459)
1460)
1461)
1462)
1463)
1464)
1465)
1466)
1467)
1468)
1469)
1470)
1471)
1472)
1473)
1474)
1475)
1476)
1477)
1478)
1479)
1480)
1481)
1482)
1483)
1484)
1485)
1486)
1487)
1488)
1489)
1490)
1491)
1492)<

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
3	SUMMARY OF OPPOSITION	1
4	FACTUAL SUMMARY	2
5	<i>Procedural Posture</i>	2
6	<i>Status of '184 patent reexaminations</i>	2
7	ARGUMENT	3
8	I. DEFENDANT'S REQUEST FOR STAY SHOULD BE DENIED AS THE	
9	FACTS ARE DISTINGUISHABLE FROM THE <i>BLACK & DECKER</i> CASE.....	3
10	II. PLAINTIFF WOULD BE UNDULY PREJUDICED AND	
11	T ACTICALLY DISADVANTAGED BY A STAY.....	4
12	A. <i>Ex Parte</i> Reexaminations Can Be Expected to Extend for Five	
13	Years or More, Rather than 18-23 Months	4
14	1. <i>A closer look at USPTO data shows the current length</i>	
15	<i>of reexamination proceedings to be far longer than</i>	
16	<i>23 months</i>	4
17	2. <i>Five-plus year reexaminations undermine congressional</i>	
18	<i>intent for use of the reexamination process.</i>	6
19	3. <i>Lengthy reexamination proceedings also undermine the</i>	
20	<i>intent of the Local Patent Rules</i>	7
21	4. <i>Caselaw supporting liberal grants of litigation stays pending the</i>	
22	<i>completion of reexamination proceedings are inapposite.</i>	8
23	B. Plaintiff Would Be Prejudiced Through The Inability To Identify	
24	and Serve All Proper Defendants.....	11
25	C. Plaintiff Would Be Prejudiced Through The Loss Of Evidence.	11

1	III. DEFENDANT IS JUDICIALLY ESTOPPED FROM CLAIMING	
2	HARDSHIP BY SEEKING DECLARATORY RELIEF.	13
3	CONCLUSION.....	15
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
2
3Cases

4 <i>Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Haworth</i> , 300 U.S. 227, 57 S.Ct. 461 (1937)	15
5 <i>American Title Ins. Co. v. Lacelaw Corp.</i> , 861 F.2d 224 (9 th Cir. 1988)	15
6 <i>ASCII Corp. v. STD Entertainment USA, Inc.</i> , 844 F.Supp. 1378	
7 (N.D. Cal. 1994).	9
8 <i>Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.</i> Civil Action No. 9:06-CV-155	
9 (E.D. Texas, 2008)	11
10 <i>Danis v. USN Communs, Inc.</i> 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16900 at *4-5	12
11 <i>Fresenius Medical Care Holdings, Inc. v. Baxter International, Inc.</i> 2007 WL	
12 1655625 (N.D. Cal. 2007)	3
13 <i>Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Releasomers, Inc.</i> , 824 F.2d 953	
14 (Fed.Cir.1987)	13
15 <i>Gould v. Control Laser Corporation</i> , 705 F.2d at 1342, 217 USPQ at 986	9
16 <i>Hughes v. Vanderbilt University</i> 215 F.3d 543, 549 (6 th Cir., 2000)	14
17 <i>In re Fordson Engineering Corp.</i> , 25 B.R. 506, 509 (Bankr.E.D.Mich.1982).	14
18 <i>Jain v. Trimas Corp.</i> , 2005 WL 2397041, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2005)	3
19 <i>MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.</i> , U.S., 127 S.Ct. 764 (2007)	13
20 <i>Madden v. Wyeth</i> , 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6427.	13
21 <i>Medichem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.</i> , 353 F.3d 928, 936 (Fed.Cir.2003)	10
22 <i>MercExchange, L.L.C. v. eBay, Inc.</i> , 500 F.Supp.2d 556 83 U.S.P.Q.2d 1688	
23 (E.D.Va. Jul 27, 2007).	11
24 <i>NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.</i> , 397 F.Supp.2d 785, (E.D.Va.2005).	10
25 <i>Patlex Corp. v. Mossinghoff</i> , 758 F.2d 594 (Fed.Cir.1985)	10
26 <i>Reid v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.</i> , 790 F.2d 453 (6th Cir.1986)	14
27 <i>Sony Electronics, Inc. v. Guardian Media Technologies, Ltd.</i> 497 F.3d 1271	
28	

SUMMARY OF OPPOSITION

The Court should deny Defendant's Motion for Stay on the grounds of a pending patent reexamination because (1) such a stay would most likely extend five years or more, creating a substantial likelihood of prejudice to Plaintiff; (2) the delay would prevent identification of any other proper defendants, who might then escape liability due to the passage of time; and (3) Defendant's counterclaim for declaratory judgment creates estoppel against Defendant's request for delay.

Defendant’s SENCO PRODUCTS, INC. (collectively, “Defendant”) Motion for Stay (Docket # 14) is largely duplicative of the motions for stay in several related cases¹, and Plaintiff’s general arguments against the propriety of a stay in those cases is applicable here and thus incorporated by reference². However, this Opposition contains data and details first described in case no. 07-CV-02321 (the “Energizer case”) that entirely changes the landscape of the issue of stay requests on the ‘184 patent cases.

Since the filing of the first few related oppositions to motions for stay, Plaintiff has learned that the approximate duration of patent reexaminations has dramatically increased in recent years from an average of 18-23 months as cited in prior arguments to the Court, to a duration likely to be closer to five years than to two years

Because of this new data, a litigation stay pending reexamination completely undermines the entire original purpose of the reexamination process – to allow a prompt forum for review of the validity of a patent. It also undermines the intent and purpose of the Local Patent Rules for streamlined patent litigation.

¹ *Sorensen v. Black & Decker Corporation, et al*, Case No. 06-cv-1572, *Sorensen v. Giant International, et al*, Case No. 07-cv-02121, and *Sorensen v. Helen of Troy, et al*, Case No. 07-cv-02278

² See *Request for Judicial Notice* for docket numbers.

The required balancing of the parties' interests weighs in favor of only a partial stay of proceedings, if that. The partial stay should allow initial discovery and motion practice to continue.

FACTUAL SUMMARY

Procedural Posture. On March 24, 2008, Defendant filed the pending Motion for Stay.

Recent other filings of '184 patent infringement cases bring the total number of cases pending before this Court to 24.

Status of ‘184 Patent Reexaminations. Patent infringement defendant Black & Decker filed an Ex Parte Request for Reexamination of the subject ‘184 patent in July 2007 (“1st reexamination”) and, on that basis, obtained an order staying the related case, *Sorensen v. Black & Decker Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 06cv1572 (“Black & Decker Order”). Now, nine months later, no first office action for the 1st reexamination has yet issued, even though Plaintiff declined to file the optional patent owner’s statement, thereby denying Black & Decker the ability to file more documents with the USPTO, in order to shave approximately two months from the process. *Kramer Decl.* ¶ 4.

Co-defendants in the Black & Decker case - Phillips Plastics and Hi-Tech Plastics – waited until December 21, 2007 to file a second third-party reexamination request (“2nd reexamination”), which the USPTO has just recently accepted. *Kramer Decl.* ¶ 5.

Closer analysis of USPTO data show that the current, average timeframe for conclusion of a reexamination is approximately five years, extending longer if an appeal to the Federal Circuit is sought. *Kramer Decl.* ¶ 6.

ARGUMENT

“A court is under no obligation to delay its own proceedings by yielding to ongoing PTO patent reexaminations, regardless of their relevancy to infringement claims which the court must analyze. [cites omitted]” *Fresenius Medical Care Holdings, Inc. v. Baxter International, Inc.* 2007 WL 1655625 (N.D. Cal. 2007).

“There is no *per se* rule that patent cases should be stayed pending reexaminations, because such a rule ‘would invite parties to unilaterally derail’ litigation.” *Soverain Software LLC v. Amazon.Com, Inc*, 356 F.Supp.2d 660, 662 (E.D.Tex.2005), quoted in *Fresenius, supra*.

Defendant seeks to derail this litigation by essentially arguing *per se* entitlement to a stay based upon the *Black & Decker* stay. That argument fails because updated information regarding the average duration of reexaminations challenges the assumptions under which that stay was issued and warrant a closer examination by the Court.

I. DEFENDANT'S REQUEST FOR STAY SHOULD BE DENIED AS THE FACTS ARE DISTINGUISHABLE FROM THE *BLACK & DECKER* CASE.

The court is not required to stay judicial resolution of a patent case in view of reexaminations, rather the decision to stay is within the discretion of the Court. *Viskase Corp. v. American Nat. Can Co.*, 261 F.3d 1316, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

A court must weigh the parties competing interests as presented by the specific facts of the case at bar. *Jain v. Trimas Corp.*, 2005 WL 2397041, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2005) (emphasis added).

This motion is materially different from the Black & Decker situation upon request for stay in at least two respects: (1) the Court now has more accurate information regarding the expected duration of reexamination proceedings; and (2) there was no extensive delay between initial contact by the Plaintiff and filing of this suit.

1 Issuance of a stay that will likely extend approximately five years, longer than
 2 the time that the parties have even been in communication, is excessive.

3 **II. PLAINTIFF WOULD BE UNDULY PREJUDICED AND TACTICALLY**
 4 **DISADVANTAGED BY A STAY.**

5 A new analysis based on USPTO statistical data shows that the likely duration
 6 of an *ex parte* reexamination proceeding is closer to five years, not two. Such a
 7 lengthy stay undermines the congressional intent for implementation of the
 8 reexamination process, and also undermines the Local Patent Rules. Furthermore,
 9 this extensive delay would prejudice the Plaintiff through inability to identify and
 10 serve all appropriate defendants and inability to locate and preserve necessary
 11 evidence and record witness testimony.

12 Thus, Plaintiff would be unduly prejudiced and subjected to a clear tactical
 13 disadvantage by a complete stay of this case pending completion of two *ex parte*
 14 reexamination proceedings before the USPTO.

16 A. *Ex Parte* Reexaminations Can Be Expected to Extend for Five Years or
 17 More, Rather than 18-23 Months.

18 Defendant's Motion for Stay relies on this Court's order to stay the related
 19 '184 patent infringement case against Black & Decker. The Black & Decker Order
 20 was based on statistical data from the USPTO's office that has since been shown to
 21 be obsolete, in that it reflects an average of all reexamination activity since 1981, and
 22 ignores the huge increase in reexamination backlog that has occurred over the past
 23 six years.

24 I. *A closer look at USPTO data shows the current length of*
 25 *reexamination proceedings to be far longer than 23 months.*

26 In the Black & Decker motion for stay, the moving parties pointed to a June
 27 2006 statistical report from the USPTO that listed average pendency of

1 reexaminations to be 22.8 months, and median pendency to be 17.6 months³ (“2006
 2 Report”). This was a material factor in the Court’s decision to stay that case.⁴
 3 However, closer examination of the USPTO’s raw data shows a remarkably different
 4 picture of the duration of reexaminations than the 2006 Report suggests.

5 The 2006 Report is based upon averages over the entire 28-year course of the
 6 existence of reexamination proceedings, since 1981. What the 2006 Report does not
 7 show is the dramatic increase in filings relative to the number of certificates issued
 8 (which signal the end of the reexamination proceeding) over the past few years.

9 USPTO Annual Reports contain statistics on the number of *ex parte*
 10 reexamination filings, the number of those that are known to be related to litigation,
 11 the number of *ex parte* reexaminations granted, and the total number of certificates
 12 issued. The official website contains annual reports back to 1993 which contain this
 13 statistical data back to 1989. *Kramer Decl.* ¶ 7, Exhibit A.

14 By comparing the incoming reexamination filings vs. the outgoing certificates,
 15 a pattern of dramatically increasing backlog appears. Assuming a zero carryover
 16 from 1988 into the 1989 figures for which records are available, the backlog of *ex*
 17 *parte* reexaminations has increased more than 100-fold from 1989 to the end of 2007
 18 (from 16 to an estimated 1,658). *Kramer Decl.* ¶ 8, Exhibit B.

19 If the PTO were able to keep issuing certificates at the rate of the highest
 20 number of reexamination certificates ever issued in a single year, 367, and have zero
 21 new filings, it would still take approximately 4.5 years for the PTO to erase the
 22 backlog of *ex parte* reexaminations. *Kramer Decl.* ¶ 9. If the rate of certificate

23
 24
 25 ³ See *Judicial Notice*, Docket #180, Exhibit B, from *Black & Decker* case.
 26
 27 ⁴ See *Judicial Notice*, Docket #243, page 7:19-22, in the *Black & Decker* case: “An
 28 average delay for reexamination of approximately 18-23 months is especially
 inconsequential where Plaintiff himself waited as many as twelve years before bringing the
 present action. (See PTO Reexamination Statistics at Ex. B to Niro Decl.; Doc. #180-3.)”

1 issuances were at the average for the past five years (250), it would take 6.6 years to
 2 erase that same backlog. *Kramer Decl.* ¶ 10.

3 The impact of this newly analyzed USPTO data extends beyond the realization
 4 that reexaminations are extending for longer and longer periods of time. Five-plus
 5 year long reexaminations (1) undermine the legislative policy underlying creation of
 6 the reexamination process in the first place; and (2) undermine this District's efforts
 7 to streamline and expedite intellectual property cases through newly implemented
 8 Local Patent Rules; and (3) render older case law on the subject of litigation stays
 9 pending reexamination inapplicable.

10 2. *Five-plus year reexaminations undermine congressional intent*
 11 *for use of the reexamination process.*

12 The express congressional intention was that reexamination should "provide a
 13 useful and necessary alternative for challengers and patent owners to test the validity
 14 of United States patents in an efficient and relatively inexpensive manner." H.R.
 15 REP. No. 96-1307 pt. 1, at 4 (1980), *reprinted in* 1980 U.S.C.C.A.N. 6460-6463.

16 All reexamination proceedings under this section, including any appeal to the
 17 Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, are to be conducted with "special
 18 dispatch." 35 U.S.C. § 305.

19 As demonstrated above, efficiency and "special dispatch" have not proven to
 20 be the case in recent years. To the contrary, the filing of reexaminations has become
 21 an effective weapon to slow down or stop patent infringement plaintiffs. This is not
 22 only demonstrated by numerous articles recommending this strategy to infringement
 23 defendants,⁵ but it is also demonstrated by the USPTO's own information. *Kramer*
Decl. ¶ 11.

25 The USPTO was already commenting on problems keeping pace with these
 26 increased litigation related filings in 2004, even though the estimated backlog was
 27

28 ⁵ See *Kramer Decl.* Exhibit D.

1 still less than 800 at the end of 2003. *Kramer Decl.* ¶ 12. In fact, the frequent use of
2 multiple reexamination requests by litigants to further delay of the litigation fueled a
3 PTO rule change in 2004 changing the standard of review for second or subsequent
4 reexamination requests.

5 These statistics are not a disparagement of the PTO's efforts. It is a
6 recognition that the recent increase in reexamination filings have overwhelmed the
7 staffing and capabilities of the PTO. The increase has made the statutory mandate of
8 "special dispatch" a meaningless phrase.

9 *Ex parte* reexamination requests known to be related to litigation have soared
10 from a mere 9% in 1990 to 57% for 2007. In fact, the frequent use of multiple
11 reexamination requests fueled a USPTO rule change in 2004 changing the standard
12 of review for second or subsequent reexamination requests.

13 The "Notice of Changes in Requirement" document (see *Kramer Decl.* ¶ 13,
14 Exhibit C) made the following statement in the Background section:

15
16 It has been the Office's experience, however, that both patent owners
17 and third party requesters have used a second or subsequent
18 reexamination request . . . to prolong the reexamination proceeding, and
19 in some instances, to turn it essentially into an *inter partes* proceeding.
20 These actions by patent owners and third party requesters have resulted
21 in multiple reexaminations taking years to conclude, thus making it
22 extremely difficult for the Office to conclude reexamination
23 proceedings with "special dispatch" as required by statute (35 U.S.C.
24 305 for *ex parte* reexamination, 35 U.S.C. 314 *inter partes*
25 reexamination).

26 While the USPTO was acknowledging having problems completing
27 reexaminations with "special dispatch" in 2004, the sheer volume of increased filings
28 since then demonstrate that the problem is even larger now. This turns what was
intended to be an efficient, timely process into an almost guaranteed strategy for
delay in patent litigation.

1
2 3. *Lengthy reexamination proceedings also undermine the intent of*
3 *the Local Patent Rules.*

4 In 2006, this Court adopted and implemented a set of Patent Local Rules with
5 the stated purpose of providing a predictable and uniform treatment for IP litigants
6 and streamline the process by which a patent case is litigated, shortening the time to
7 trial or settlement and thereby reducing costs for all parties involved. The new rules
8 set up a schedule where a claim construction hearing would be held approximately
9 nine months after the complaint is filed, and trials set at approximately 18 months
10 after complaints are filed. *Kramer Decl.* ¶ 14.

11 Judge Dana M. Sabraw, who chaired the committee that established the new
12 patent local rules, said: “A majority of the judges of the Southern District are firmly
13 committed to holding claim construction hearings within nine months for the filing
14 of the complaint, and to setting a trial date within 18 months of that filing.” *Kramer*
15 *Decl.* ¶ 15, Exhibit D.

16 None of these purposes and intents can be met when an infringement
17 defendant can file an *ex parte* reexamination request and receive an almost automatic
18 multi-year exception from the timeline set out in the Local Rules.

19 While district judges are working to streamline and expedite patent cases, the
20 USPTO’s statutorily-required “special dispatch” procedure has been getting slower
21 and slower.

22 The net effect in this case and the related ‘184 infringement cases is that two
23 carefully timed *ex parte* reexamination have been relied upon to deny Plaintiff the
24 ability to enforce its valid patent.

25 4. *Caselaw supporting liberal grants of litigation stays pending the*
26 *completion of reexamination proceedings are inapposite.*

27 It is no surprise that so many *ex parte* reexamination requests are flooding the
28 USPTO. These filings have become an oft-used weapon by patent infringement

1 defendants because litigation stays are routinely granted pending conclusion of
 2 reexamination. In 1990, the percentage of *ex parte* filings that were known to be
 3 related to litigation was a mere nine percent (9%). By 2007, after a host of
 4 publications had pushed reexamination as a litigation strategy for defendants, the
 5 percentage had increased more than six-fold to 57%.

6 The *Black & Decker* Order was based on legal opinions that either predated
 7 the recent dramatic increase in filings and consequent backlog of cases, or opinions
 8 that relied on that same outdated factual scenario.

9 The issue in the *Ethicon* case was whether the PTO could stay a reexamination
 10 pending completion of a court case, not the other way around. The *Ethicon* court did
 11 cite *Gould v. Control Laser Corporation*, 705 F.2d at 1342, 217 USPQ at 986, for
 12 the proposition that the court had authority to order a stay pending conclusion of a
 13 PTO reexamination. What the *Gould* decision actually said was that “power already
 14 resides with the Court to prevent costly pretrial maneuvering which attempts to
 15 circumvent the reexamination procedure.” (emphasis in original). Plaintiff has done
 16 nothing here or in related cases trying to circumvent the reexamination procedure.

17 The “‘liberal policy’ in favor of granting motions to stay pending the outcome
 18 of PTO reexamination proceedings” (Docket #243, page 5:19-21) came from the
 19 1994 case of *ASCII Corp. v. STD Entertainment USA, Inc.*, 844 F.Supp. 1378, 1381
 20 (N.D. Cal. 1994). A close look at that decision reveals a statement by the court that
 21 “it is clear from the cases cited by the parties that there is a liberal policy of granting
 22 stays pending reexamination,” but does not directly cite to any particular case.
 23 Furthermore, even if the Court had evaluated the approximately length of
 24 reexamination proceedings in 1994 (there is no indication that it did), it would have
 25 shown that the USPTO was effectively handling its caseload, issuing almost as many
 26 certificates in a year as new requests that were being accepted. A liberal policy of
 27 granting motions to stay pending the outcome of reexamination proceedings was
 28 fully appropriate in 1994. That is no longer the case.

1 *Photoflex Products, Inc. v. Circa 3 LLC*, No. C 04-03715 JSW, 2006 U.S.
 2 Dist. LEXIS 37743, at *2-3 (N.D.Cal. May 24, 2006), also relies on the
 3 misconstrued *Gould* case, and the outdated *ASCII* case, as did the other cases.

4 None of the cases cited in the *Black & Decker* order appear to give any
 5 consideration whatsoever to the relative length of time that the reexamination will
 6 take. In more recent cases, however, Courts are beginning to acknowledge the
 7 extended duration of reexamination proceedings and are exercising their inherent
 8 authority to not stay proceedings pending reexaminations that can take years to
 9 complete.

10 A court is under no obligation to delay its own proceedings by yielding
 11 to ongoing PTO patent reexaminations, regardless of their relevancy to
 12 infringement claims which the court must analyze. *See id.* (“The
 13 [district] court is not required to stay judicial resolution in view of the
 14 [PTO] reexaminations.”); *see also Medicem, S.A. v. Rolabo, S.L.*, 353
 15 F.3d 928, 936 (Fed.Cir.2003) (“[O]n remand, a stay of proceedings in
 16 the district court pending the outcome of the parallel proceedings in the
 17 PTO remains an option within the district court's discretion.”) (stated in
 18 the context of reissue proceedings for interfering patents before the
 19 Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences); *Patlex Corp. v.
 20 Mossinghoff*, 758 F.2d 594, 602-03 (Fed.Cir.1985) (recognizing judicial
 21 discretion in stay determinations for patent proceedings).

22 *NTP, Inc. v. Research in Motion, Ltd.*, 397 F.Supp.2d 785, 787 (E.D.Va.2005).
 23 (2005).

24 The *NTP* court was adamant that it was not going to stay litigation based upon
 25 the moving party's unfounded speculation that the patent would soon be invalidated.

26 The likely duration and result of the PTO's reexamination proceedings
 27 and any subsequent (and likely) appeals are in dispute. RIM, turning a
 28 blind eye to the many steps that must still be taken before a final
 determination can be issued by the PTO and confirmed, suggests that
 the patents-in-suit will be invalidated in a matter of *months*. NTP, on the
 other hand, insists on the likelihood of the opposite result and gives a
 reality-based estimated time frame of *years*. Regardless of which party's
 predictions this Court might adopt, any attempt at suggesting a likely
 time frame and outcome of the PTO reexamination process is merely

1 speculation. This Court cannot and will not grant RIM the extraordinary
 2 remedy of delaying these proceedings any further than they already
 3 have been based on conjecture.

4 *Id.*

5 Further, the case of *Blackboard, Inc. v. Desire2Learn, Inc.* Civil Action No.
 6 9:06-CV-155 (E.D. Texas, 2008), recently proceeded to plaintiff's verdict despite ex
 7 *parte* and *inter partes* reexaminations that had been ordered 13 months previous in
 8 which no office actions had been issued.

9 Other cases have reaffirmed that district courts are not obligated to issue stays,
 10 including *MercExchange, L.L.C. v. eBay, Inc.*, 500 F.Supp.2d 556, 562, 83
 11 U.S.P.Q.2d 1688 (E.D.Va. Jul 27, 2007).

12 Because the re-analyzed USPTO data show that the 1st reexamination on the
 13 '184 patent is likely to not be complete for approximately 5 years from its filing, and
 14 because the 2nd reexamination has the potential to introduce even further delay in the
 15 completion of reexamination proceedings, a stay pending reexamination by the
 16 USPTO should not be granted.

17 **B. Plaintiff Would Be Prejudiced Through The Inability To Identify and**
Serve All Proper Defendants.

18 As detailed more fully in the previously filed related oppositions to motions
 19 for stay, Fed.R. Civ.P, Rule 15(c), places limitations on a party's ability to amend
 20 pleadings to add or substitute parties, and places restrictions on when such
 21 amendments relate back to the date of the initial filings. Inability to identify
 22 responsible parties inhibits the ability to give those parties notice of the case, thereby
 23 increasing the chance that they will claim prejudice later, and increasing the
 24 likelihood that other parties will destroy or dispose of critical evidence.

25 A complete stay of litigation before any preliminary steps are taken to identify
 26 proper parties and ensure initial discovery or preservation of evidence greatly
 27 prejudices the Plaintiff and may well prejudice the entire judicial process in this case.

1 C. Plaintiff Would Be Prejudiced Through The Loss Of Evidence.

2 The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not expressly impose a duty to
 3 preserve evidence. Courts have construed the federal discovery rules, particularly
 4 Rule 26, to imply a duty to preserve all evidence that may be relevant in a case. *See*
 5 *Danis v. USN Communs, Inc.*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16900 at *4-5.

6 The obligation to preserve arises when the party has notice that the evidence
 7 is relevant to litigation -- most commonly when the suit has already been filed, providing the party responsible for the destruction
 8 with express notice, but also on occasion in other circumstances, as for example when a party should have known that the evidence may
 9 be relevant to future litigation.

10 *Treppel v. Biovail Corp.*, 233 F.R.D. 363, 371 (2006).

11 If a complete stay is issued, there is no assurance that parties (whether parties to the suit or otherwise) will have knowledge of any obligation to preserve evidence, and in the case of third-party suppliers would actually have a disincentive to preserve evidence.

12 A preservation order protects the producing party by clearly defining the extent of its preservation obligations. *Id.* at 370. "In the absence of such an order, that party runs the risk of future sanctions if discoverable information is lost because [the party] has miscalculated." *Id.* Further, "[preservation] orders are increasingly routine in cases involving electronic evidence, such as e-mails and other forms of electronic communication." *Id.* at 370. Because the duty of preservation exists without a court order, some courts are reluctant to grant motions to preserve evidence. *See Madden v. Wyeth*, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6427.

13 Plaintiff needs to have an opportunity to conduct at least preliminary discovery and request a detailed preservation order, otherwise it will be subjected to substantial prejudice as a result of a stay.

1 Motions to stay pending patent reexamination have been denied where the
 2 likely length of reexamination will serve to exacerbate the risk of lost evidence. In
 3 *Telemac Corp. v. Teledigital, Inc.*, 450 F.Supp.2d 1107, 1111 (N.D.Cal. 2006). That
 4 is very much the situation here.

5

6 III. DEFENDANT IS JUDICIALLY ESTOPPED FROM SEEKING A STAY IN
 7 LIGHT OF ITS COUNTERCLAIM FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF.

8 Defendant has asserted in its Rule 11-governed responsive pleading a
 9 counterclaim under the Declaratory Judgment at 28 USC §§ 2201 *et seq.* “[T]he
 10 purpose of the Declaratory Judgment Act in patent cases is to provide the allegedly
 11 infringing party **relief from** uncertainty and **delay** regarding its legal rights.” *Sony*
 12 *Electronics, Inc. v. Guardian Media Technologies, Ltd.* 497 F.3d 1271 (Fed.Cir.
 13 2007) quoting *Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Releasomers, Inc.*, 824 F.2d 953, 956
 14 (Fed.Cir.1987) (emphasis added).

15 Further, the *Sony* Court noted that the U.S. Supreme Court had stated in its
 16 decision in *MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*, --- U.S. ----, 127 S.Ct. 764, 771 166
 17 L.Ed.2d 604 (2007) that the test of a declaratory judgment claim for relief is whether
 18 “there is a substantial controversy, between parties having adverse legal interests, of
 19 **sufficient immediacy** and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.”
 20 quoting *Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Haworth*, 300 U.S. 227, 240-1, 57 S.Ct. 461, 81 L.Ed.
 21 617 (1937) (emphasis added).

22 The allegations in Defendant’s counterclaim, rely upon the Declaratory
 23 Judgment Act, and thus are judicial admissions that Defendant claims that its legal
 24 rights are of “sufficient immediacy” that it needs “relief from . . . delay regarding its
 25 legal rights.”

26 Parties “are bound by admissions in their pleadings, and a party cannot create
 27 a factual issue by subsequently filing a conflicting affidavit.” *Hughes v. Vanderbilt*

1 University 215 F.3d 543, 549 (6th Cir., 2000) *citing Reid v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*,
 2 790 F.2d 453, 460 (6th Cir.1986).

3 The Court in *American Title Ins. Co. v. Lacelaw Corp.*, 861 F.2d 224, 226 (9th
 4 Cir. 1988) stated: “Factual assertions in pleadings and pretrial orders, unless
 5 amended, are considered judicial admissions conclusively binding on party who
 6 made them.” The *American Title* Court further observed that: “Judicial admissions
 7 are formal admissions in the pleadings which have the effect of withdrawing a fact
 8 from issue and dispensing wholly with the need for proof of the fact.” *In re Fordson*
 9 *Engineering Corp.*, 25 B.R. 506, 509 (Bankr.E.D.Mich.1982). Factual assertions in
 10 pleadings and pretrial orders, unless amended, are considered judicial admissions
 11 conclusively binding on the party who made them. *See White v. Arco/Polymers,*
 12 *Inc.*, 720 F.2d 1391, 1396 (5th Cir.1983); *Fordson*, 25 B.R. at 509.

13 Further, the Court in *Soo Line R. Co. v. St. Louis Southwestern Ry.*, 125 F.3d
 14 481, 483 (7th Cir. 1997) concluded: “although the rule smacks of legalism, judicial
 15 efficiency demands that a party not be allowed to controvert what it has already
 16 unequivocally told a court by the most formal and considered means possible.”

17 Defendant’s formal admission that they are entitled to “relief from delay”
 18 cannot be overcome by Defendants simply by filing a motion and declaration
 19 asserting the opposite position. Rather, Defendant is held to its judicial admission
 20 that it need relief from delay regarding their legal rights – i.e., Defendant does not
 21 need a stay – and is estopped from arguing for a stay of the present litigation.

22 Because Defendant is barred by its judicial admissions from seeking a stay in
 23 light of its declaratory relief request for relief from delay, Defendant’s request for
 24 stay must be denied.

CONCLUSION

There is no *per se* rule that patent cases should be stayed pending reexamination. The perception of such a rule has invited parties such as Defendants to move for stay on the sole grounds that someone else's reexamination request is pending before the USPTO.

A complete stay on all aspects of all '184 patent cases is not appropriate as this Court has recently confirmed in its orders on Helen of Troy/OXO and Giant's motions for stay.

Plaintiff has now presented the Court will newly analyzed USPTO data that change the entire framework in which the Court enter stays in the three earliest '184 patent case stays. This warrants a new look and new balance of the equities involved in staying this and the other '184 lawsuits.

Because the new data shows that a litigation stay pending reexamination completely undermines the entire original purpose of the reexamination process, as well as the Local Patent Rules, and would act to prejudice the Plaintiff in numerous respects, the Court should deny the requested stay.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this Wednesday, April 16, 2008.

JENS ERIK SORENSEN, as Trustee of
SORENSEN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
TRUST, Plaintiff

/s/ J. Michael Kaler

J. Michael Kaler, Esq.
Melody A. Kramer, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 PROOF OF SERVICE
2

3 I, J. Michael Kaler, declare: I am and was at the time of this service working within in the
4 County of San Diego, California. I am over the age of 18 year and not a party to the within action.
5 My business address is the Kaler Law Offices, 9930 Mesa Rim Road, Suite 200, San Diego,
6 California, 92121.

7 On Wednesday, April 16, 2008, I served the following documents:
8

9
10 OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY PENDING OUTCOME OF
11 REEXAMINATION PROCEEDINGS

12 DECLARATION OF MELODY A. KRAMER IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO
13 DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY PENDING OUTCOME OF REEXAMINATION
14 PROCEEDINGS

15 REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S
16 MOTION TO STAY PENDING OUTCOME OF REEXAMINATION PROCEEDINGS

17 PERSON(S) SERVED	18 PARTY(IES) SERVED	19 METHOD OF 20 SERVICE
21 Roger G. Perkins, Esq rperkins@mpplaw.com MORRIS POLICH & PURDY LLP 501 West Broadway, Suite 500 San Diego, California 92101	22 Senco Products, Inc.	23 Email - Pleadings Filed with the Court via ECF
24 Angela Kim akim@mpplaw.com MORRIS POLICH & PURDY LLP 501 West Broadway, Suite 500 San Diego, California 92101	25 Senco Products, Inc.	26 Email - Pleadings Filed with the Court via ECF
27 Robert S. Mallin Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione NBC Tower 455 N City Front Plaza Drive Suite 3600 Chicago, IL 60611 rmallin@brinkshofer.com	28 Senco Products, Inc.	29 Email - Pleadings Filed with the Court via ECF

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
5610
5611
5612
5613
5614
5615
5616
5617
5618
5619
5620
5621
5622
5623
5624
5625
5626
5627
5628
5629
5630
5631
5632
5633
5634
5635
5636
5637
5638
5639
5640
5641
5642
5643
5644
5645
5646
5647
5648
5649
5650
5651
5652
5653
5654
5655
5656
5657
5658
5659
5660
5661
5662
5663
5664
5665
5666
5667
5668
5669
56610
56611
56612
56613
56614
56615
56616
56617
56618
56619
56620
56621
56622
56623
56624
56625
56626
56627
56628
56629
56630
56631
56632
56633
56634
56635
56636
56637
56638
56639
56640
56641
56642
56643
56644
56645
56646
56647
56648
56649
56650
56651
56652
56653
56654
56655
56656
56657
56658
56659
56660
56661
56662
56663
56664
56665
56666
56667
56668
56669
566610
566611
566612
566613
566614
566615
566616
566617
566618
566619
566620
566621
566622
566623
566624
566625
566626
566627
566628
566629
566630
566631
566632
566633
566634
566635
566636
566637
566638
566639
566640
566641
566642
566643
566644
566645
566646
566647
566648
566649
566650
566651
566652
566653
566654
566655
566656
566657
566658
566659
566660
566661
566662
566663
566664
566665
566666
566667
566668
566669
5666610
5666611
5666612
5666613
5666614
5666615
5666616
5666617
5666618
5666619
5666620
5666621
5666622
5666623
5666624
5666625
5666626
5666627
5666628
5666629
5666630
5666631
5666632
5666633
5666634
5666635
5666636
5666637
5666638
5666639
5666640
5666641
5666642
5666643
5666644
5666645
5666646
5666647
5666648
5666649
5666650
5666651
5666652
5666653
5666654
5666655
5666656
5666657
5666658
5666659
5666660
5666661
5666662
5666663
5666664
5666665
5666666
5666667
5666668
5666669
56666610
56666611
56666612
56666613
56666614
56666615
56666616
56666617
56666618
56666619
56666620
56666621
56666622
56666623
56666624
56666625
56666626
56666627
56666628
56666629
56666630
56666631
56666632
56666633
56666634
56666635
56666636
56666637
56666638
56666639
56666640
56666641
56666642
56666643
56666644
56666645
56666646
56666647
56666648
56666649
56666650
56666651
56666652
56666653
56666654
56666655
56666656
56666657
56666658
56666659
56666660
56666661
56666662
56666663
56666664
56666665
56666666
56666667
56666668
56666669
566666610
566666611
566666612
566666613
566666614
566666615
566666616
566666617
566666618
566666619
566666620
566666621
566666622
566666623
566666624
566666625
566666626
566666627
566666628
566666629
566666630
566666631
566666632
566666633
566666634
566666635
566666636
566666637
566666638
566666639
566666640
566666641
566666642
566666643
566666644
566666645
566666646
566666647
566666648
566666649
566666650
566666651
566666652
566666653
566666654
566666655
566666656
566666657
566666658
566666659
566666660
566666661
566666662
566666663
566666664
566666665
566666666
566666667
566666668
566666669
5666666610
5666666611
5666666612
5666666613
5666666614
5666666615
5666666616
5666666617
5666666618
5666666619
5666666620
5666666621
5666666622
5666666623
5666666624
5666666625
5666666626
5666666627
5666666628
5666666629
5666666630
5666666631
5666666632
5666666633
5666666634
5666666635
5666666636
5666666637
5666666638
5666666639
5666666640
5666666641
5666666642
5666666643
5666666644
5666666645
5666666646
5666666647
5666666648
5666666649
5666666650
5666666651
5666666652
5666666653
5666666654
5666666655
5666666656
5666666657
5666666658
5666666659
5666666660
5666666661
5666666662
5666666663
5666666664
5666666665
5666666666
5666666667
5666666668
5666666669
56666666610
56666666611
56666666612
56666666613
56666666614
56666666615
56666666616
56666666617
56666666618
56666666619
56666666620
56666666621
56666666622
56666666623
56666666624
56666666625
56666666626
56666666627
56666666628
56666666629
56666666630
56666666631
56666666632
56666666633
56666666634
56666666635
56666666636
56666666637
56666666638
56666666639
56666666640
56666666641
56666666642
56666666643
56666666644
56666666645
56666666646
56666666647
56666666648
56666666649
56666666650
56666666651
56666666652
56666666653
56666666654
56666666655
56666666656
56666666657
56666666658
56666666659
56666666660
56666666661
56666666662
56666666663
56666666664
56666666665
56666666666
56666666667
56666666668
56666666669
566666666610
566666666611
566666666612
566666666613
566666666614
566666666615
566666666616
566666666617
566666666618
566666666619
566666666620
566666666621
566666666622
566666666623
566666666624
566666666625
566666666626
566666666627
566666666628
566666666629
566666666630
566666666631
566666666632
566666666633
566666666634
566666666635
566666666636
566666666637
566666666638
566666666639
566666666640
566666666641
566666666642
566666666643
566666666644
566666666645
566666666646
566666666647
566666666648
566666666649
566666666650
566666666651
566666666652
566666666653
566666666654
566666666655
566666666656
566666666657
566666666658
566666666659
566666666660
566666666661
566666666662
566666666663
566666666664
566666666665
566666666666
566666666667
566666666668
566666666669
5666666666610
5666666666611
5666666666612
5666666666613
5666666666614
5666666666615
5666666666616
5666666666617
5666666666618
5666666666619
5666666666620
5666666666621
5666666666622
5666666666623
5666666666624
5666666666625
5666666666626
5666666666627
5666666666628
5666666666629
5666666666630
5666666666631
5666666666632
5666666666633
5666666666634
5666666666635
5666666666636
5666666666637
5666666666638
5666666666639
5666666666640
5666666666641
5666666666642
5666666666643
5666666666644
5666666666645
5666666666646
5666666666647
5666666666648
5666666666649
5666666666650
5666666666651
5666666666652
5666666666653
5666666666654
5666666666655
5666666666656
5666666666657
5666666666658
5666666666659
5666666666660
5666666666661
5666666666662
5666666666663
5666666666664
5666666666665
5666666666666
5666666666667
5666666666668
5666666666669
56666666666610
56666666666611
56666666666612
56666666666613
56666666666614
56666666666615
56666666666616
56666666666617
56666666666618
56666666666619
56666666666620
56666666666621
56666666666622
56666666666623
56666666666624
56666666666625
56666666666626
56666666666627
56666666666628
56666666666629
56666666666630
56666666666631
56666666666632
56666666666633
56666666666634
56666666666635
56666666666636
56666666666637
56666666666638
56666666666639
56666666666640
56666666666641
56666666666642
56666666666643
56666666666644
56666666666645
56666666666646
56666666666647
56666666666648
56666666666649
56666666666650
56666666666651
56666666666652
56666666666653
56666666666654
56666666666655
56666666666656
56666666666657
56666666666658
56666666666659
56666666666660
56666666666661
56666666666662
56666666666663
56666666666664
56666666666665
56666666666666
56666666666667
56666666666668
56666666666669
566666666666610
566666666666611
566666666666612
566666666666613
566666666666614
566666666666615
566666666666616
566666666666617
566666666666618
566666666666619
566666666666620
566666666666621
566666666666622
566666666666623
566666666666624
566666666666625
566666666666626
566666666666627
566666

1

2 (Facsimile) I caused a true copy of the foregoing documents to be transmitted by
facsimile machine to the above noted addressees. The facsimile transmissions were
reported as complete and without error.

3

4 (Email) I emailed a true copy of the foregoing documents to an email address
represented to be the correct email address for the above noted addressee.

5

6 (Email--Pleadings Filed with the Court) Pursuant to Local Rules, I electronically filed
this document via the CM/ECF system for the United States District Court for the
Southern District of California.

7

8 (U.S. Mail) I mailed a true copy of the foregoing documents to a mail address
represented to be the correct mail address for the above noted addressee.

9

10 I declare that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on
11 Wednesday, April 16, 2008, in San Diego, California.

12

13

 /s/ J. Michael Kaler

14 J. Michael Kaler

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28